

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this Application and entry of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

With entry of this amendment, claims 1, 4-17, and 19-22 are currently pending in the application. Claim 20 has been amended for purposes of clarity. Support for the amendment of claim 20 may be found in paragraphs 00036 and 00052 *inter alia*. Claims 21 and 22 are new. No new matter is believed added by this amendment. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication, in paragraph 6 of the outstanding Action, that claims 1, 4-17 and 19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection in View of Douk

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,911,036 to Douk *et al.*, hereinafter “Douk.” Applicants traverse this rejection because Douk fails to teach all the elements of the claim 20, as amended. Douk fails to teach

. . . frictional control means disposed within the hollow guidewire such that axial movement of the core wire within the hollow guidewire is easier in a first direction than in a second, opposite direction,

as now required by claim 20, in part. At the end of paragraph 5, the rejection cites Douk column 5, lines 45-50 as teaching “that different amount of friction can be achieved by selecting the amplitude, or maximal transverse dimension of bends 160.” Applicants agree that Douk inherently teaches that different amounts of friction can be achieved inasmuch as Douk teaches a frictional interference fit between a bent portion of the core wire and the hollow shaft. However, whatever the selected amount of friction achieved with the bends in Douk’s core wire, that friction will be substantially equal for translation of the core wire in a first direction and in a second, opposite direction. Nowhere does Douk disclose, explicitly or inherently, that a frictional interference fit can be arranged to provide different amounts of friction depending upon which axial direction the core wire is translated within the hollow guidewire. Therefore, the

rejection of claim 20 is improper because Douk fails to teach all the elements of the claim, as required for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In view of the above arguments, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 01-2525. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at telephone (978) 739-3075 (Eastern Time).

Respectfully submitted,

/James F. Crittenden/
James F. Crittenden
Registration No. 39,560
Agent for Applicant

Medtronic Vascular, Inc.
3576 Unocal Place
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Facsimile No.: (707) 543-5420